

ORIGINAL

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

March 17, 2011

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 10-10202  
Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

SIYUAN LIU,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

LEE F. JACKSON, as Chancellor of the University of North Texas System;  
DOCTOR SCOTT RANSOM, as President of the University of North Texas  
Health Science Center; DOCTOR THOMAS MOORMAN, a natural person,

Defendants - Appellees

\_\_\_\_\_  
CONSOLIDATED WITH 10-10674  
\_\_\_\_\_

SIYUAN LIU,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

DOCTOR THOMAS MOORMAN, a natural person,

Defendant - Appellee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas (Ft. Worth Div.)  
USDC 4:09-CV-415  
\_\_\_\_\_

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DIST. OF TX.  
FT. WORTH DIVISION  
2011 APR 13 PM 1:38  
CLERK OF COURT



No. 10-10202 c/w 10-10674

Before KING, BENAVIDES, and ELROD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Plaintiff-Appellant Siyuan Liu contends that the district court did not consider his claim of fraud on the court. However, Liu never presented a motion to the district court regarding the alleged fraud on the court or attempted in any way to seek relief from the district court on this issue. Instead, Liu filed a notice of appeal from the district court's orders granting Defendants-Appellees' 12(b) motions to dismiss, even though nothing contained in the 12(b) motions relates to the granting or denial of any fraud on the court allegations as set out in the complaint. Because Liu failed to seek relief on his fraud on the court claim from the district court, this issue is not properly before us. In addition, in his briefs on appeal, Liu fails to allege any error by the district court regarding his 12(b) dismissals. *See Sanders v. Unum Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 553 F.3d 922, 926 (5th Cir. 2008) ("A party waives an issue if he fails to adequately brief it on appeal.").

AFFIRMED.

---

\* Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.